



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/802,321

03/17/2004

Stefan Bengt Edlund

IBM-014

3735

51835 7590 02/22/2007

IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW
c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ
5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752

EXAMINER

RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,321

Applicant(s)

EDLUND ET AL.

Examiner

Susan F. Rayyan

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/22/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Susan F. Rayyan
2/13/07

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 11, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Applicant has provided evidence in this file showing that the invention was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity as US 2003/0158866 at the time this invention was made, or was subject to a joint research agreement at the time this invention was made. However, reference 2003/0158866 additionally qualifies as prior art under another subsection of 35 U.S.C. 102, and therefore, is not disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(c).

Applicant may overcome the applied art either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that the invention disclosed therein was derived from the invention of this application, and is therefore, not the invention "by another," or by antedating the applied art under 37 CFR 1.131.

DETAILED ACTION

2. Claims 1-20, 26-27 are pending.
3. Claims 21-25 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-20, 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0172113 A1 issued to Brian A. Cameron et al ("Cameron") in view of US Patent Number 2003/0158866 A1 issued to James P. Goodwin et al ("Goodwin").

As per independent claim 1, Cameron teaches a method for synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a server database and transmitting documents (paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client).

Cameron does not explicitly teach calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the client and transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score. Goodwin does teach these limitations (paragraph 109, lines 22-26 as document score used to bring documents to the user and paragraph 69 as threshold value) to maintain current information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2167

the invention to modify Cameron with calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the client and transmitting one of the documents to maintain current information (paragraph 43, lines 6-7).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting the one of the documents in the server database to the client if the respective document score exceeds a threshold value (paragraph 69, threshold value).

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has been read, a time of last access of the document, an author of the document and a term in the document (paragraph 109, lines 8-13 , last update, times opened).

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph 114, relationship between documents).

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 6 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client ...if the one of the documents is not stored in the client database (paragraph 8,10, server documents are downloaded to the client (small device)).

Cameron does not explicitly teach a document score Goodwin does teach these limitations (paragraph 109, lines 22-26 as document score used to bring documents to the user and paragraph 69 as threshold value) to maintain current information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cameron with a document score transmitting one of the documents to maintain current information (paragraph 43, lines 6-7).

As per claim 7 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

determining if the client database includes a newly created document and transmitting the newly created document to the server (paragraph 42, lines 1-5, synchronizing document additions).

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

further comprising assigning a document score having a maximum value to the newly created document (paragraph 67, lines 21-23, authoring a document is given a high weight).

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

determining if the client database includes a modified document and transmitting the modified document to the server (paragraph 28, edited documents on client are transmitted to the server).

As per claim 10 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

further comprising assigning a document score having a maximum value to the modified document (paragraph 109, lines 1-13 as document parameters are assigned weights which are used to compute the document score).

As per claim 11 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further comprising designating for deletion one of the client documents based on a document score of a complementary document in the server database (paragraph 109, lines 22-26, documents sent to user based on document score).

As per claim 12 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further comprising removing one of the client documents from the client database... of a complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, deleting document from client).

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

further comprising resolving a conflict between the modified document in the client database and a modified document in the server database (paragraph 100, conflicting parts of documents are resolved).

As per claim 14 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising removing the designation for deletion based on a document score of the complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, updating document).

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising increasing a data storage capacity of the client by deleting the one of the client documents designated for deletion (paragraph 12, deleted documents increase the storage capacity).

As per independent claim 16 Cameron teaches;

A computer program product for use with a computer system having a server with a server database, the server database storing a plurality of documents accessible to a client(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client).

Cameron does not explicitly teach program code for calculating a document score for each of the documents, the document score designating an importance of the document

Art Unit: 2167

to a client; and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score.

Goodwin does teach these limitations (paragraph 109, lines 22-26 as document score used to bring documents to the user and paragraph 69 as threshold value) to maintain current information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cameron with program code for calculating a document score for each of the documents, the document score designating an importance of the document to a client; and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score. to maintain current information (paragraph 43, lines 6-7).

As per claim 17 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the program code embodied in the computer useable medium further comprises program code for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents in the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score exceeds the threshold value(paragraph 69, threshold value).

As per claim 19 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has been read, a time of last access of the document, an author of the document and a term in the document(paragraph 109, lines 8-13 , last update, times opened).

As per claim 20 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph 114, relationship between documents).

As per independent claim 26 Cameron teaches:

An apparatus for synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a server database(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client), the apparatus comprising:

Cameron does not explicitly teach means for calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the client; and means for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score.

Goodwin does teach these limitations (paragraph 109, lines 22-26 as document score used to bring documents to the user and paragraph 69 as threshold value) to maintain current information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cameron with calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the client; and means for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score to maintain current information (paragraph 43, lines 6-7).

As per claim 27 same as claim arguments above and Goodwin teaches:

further comprising means for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents in the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score exceeds the threshold value(paragraph 69, threshold value).

Claims 3,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0172113 A1 issued to Brian A. Cameron et al ("Cameron") in view of US Patent Number 2003/0158899 A1 issued to James P. Goodwin et al ("Goodwin") in view of US Patent Number 7,092,977 B2 issued to Albert Leung et al ("Leung").

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Cameron and Goodwin do not explicitly teach the threshold value based on a data storage capacity of the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cameron and Goodwin with the threshold value based on a data storage capacity of the client to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources (Abstract).

As per claim 18 same as claim arguments above and Cameron and Goodwin do not explicitly teach wherein the determination of the threshold value is based on a data storage capacity of the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cameron and Goodwin with the determination of the threshold value is based on a data storage capacity of the client to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources (Abstract).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

Contact Information


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Susan Rayyan

February 13, 2007


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100